

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/574,907		NISHIMURA ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Melvin Curtis Mayes		1793	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Melvin Curtis Mayes.

(3) John W. Bailey

(2) Yun Qian

(4) Chap M. Rink

Date of Interview: 4/28/2010

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed: Mizumoto et al (US. 4,631,263)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Mr. Bailey and Mr. Rink and the Examiners discussed the recent office action. Applicants propose ~~amendment~~ to amend claim 1. Examiners believe that prior art of Mizumoto et. al teaches the catalyst inside its layers (see Fig 2). Examiners suggest to add additional distinguish features to claim 1. No agreement is reached.